

Remarks

Prior to entry of this amendment, claims 1-28 were pending and subject to a requirement for restriction. By this amendment, claim 19 has been amended to correct an obvious clerical error as suggested by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

After entry of this amendment, **claims 1-28 are pending** and ready for substantive examination. Reconsideration and modification (or withdrawal) of the requirement for restriction is requested.

Telephone Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Arnold for taking the time to interview this case with their undersigned representative on January 17, 2008, and particularly for the Examiner's helpful discussion and suggestions. Applicants' representative inquired as to why the descriptions of Groups I, II and III were identical in the pending Restriction Requirement, and the Examiner clarified that the differences between the three Groups could be found in the claims that had been assigned thereto. Applicants' representative then stated her understanding of the scope of the three Groups (as detailed below), to which the Examiner agreed. Applicants' representative pointed out that, if this interpretation of scope is correct, then claims 24-28 belong with Group I rather than Group III. The Examiner concurred. Thus, Applicants' response is based on this re-definition of the Examiner's Groups. It is believed that agreement was reached regarding the scope of the Groups defined in the pending Restriction Requirement.

Requirement for Restriction to a Single Group

In view of the telephone interview on January 17, Applicants understand that the pending claims have been subject to a requirement for restriction as follows: **Group I:** Claims 16, 18, and 24-28 relate to methods where the subject has elevated blood pressure; **Group II:** Claims 17 and 19 relate to methods where the subject has a hemolytic condition; **Group III:** Claims 20-23 relate to methods where the subject has a decrease in blood flow to a tissue; and Claims 1-15 are linking claims across the three Groups. The requirement for restriction to one of the linked Groups is subject to the nonallowance of linking claims 1-15.

Applicants thank the Examiner for confirming in the Office action that the restriction requirement will be withdrawn once linking claim(s) are found to be allowable.

As required, Applicants hereby elect Group III (methods, where the subject has a decrease in blood flow to a tissue), with the understanding that claims 1-15 and 20-23 will therefore be examined initially.

Applicants do not concede that the reference cited at the top of page 4 of the pending Office action (U.S. Patent No. 4,849,226) teaches anything relevant to the pending claims. Nothing in this response should be taken as a waiver of Applicants' right to traverse statements related to that reference made in the Office action.

Requirement for Species Election

Further, the Office action requires that Applicants elect for initial prosecution a single "species" from the lists included in each of claims 14, 18, 19, 21, and 23. With regard to the species election within claim 23, Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out that certain of the listed tissues will be considered together. As required, Applicants hereby elect species from these lists:

- I. (claim 14, "additional agent" species): phosphodiesterase inhibitor; all claims 1-28 read on this species
- II. (claim 18, "vascular complication" species): an ischemic central nervous system event; at least claims 1-16 and 18 read on this species
- III (claim 19, "hemolytic condition" species): sickle cell anemia; at least claims 1-15, 17 and 19 read on this species
- IV. (claim 21, "condition directly or indirectly causing decreased blood flow to a tissue" species): an ischemic central nervous system event; at least claims 1-15 and 20-23 read on this species
- V. (claim 23, "tissue" species): neuronal tissue/central nervous tissue; at least claims 1-15 and 20-23 read on this species

Applicants understand that those portions of claims directed to non-elected species will be rejoined in the present application upon allowance of a generic claim. Such action is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, the claims are in condition for substantive examination and such is requested. If for any reason the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite examination of the claims, please telephone the undersigned at (503) 595-5300.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 595-5300
Facsimile: (503) 595-5301

By /Tanya M. Harding/
Tanya M. Harding, Ph.D.
Registration No. 42,630